

5-8-1974

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/08/1974

Esther Peterson

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Peterson, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 05/08/1974" (1974). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 475.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/475>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES: Special Senate Meeting, 8 May 1974
Presiding Officer: Catherine J. Sands, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Peterson

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except James Brooks, Zolton Kramar and B. Dean Owens.

Visitors Present: Pearl Douce', Bernard Martin, Victor Marx and Roger Reynolds.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested the following changes to the Agenda:

Add "Communications" -- letter from Vice President Harrington, dated May 8, 1974, as Item No. III.

Change Item III to IV - New Business.

Change Item IV to V - Old Business.

Change Item V to VI - Adjournment.

Mr. Leavitt asked about a report from the Executive Committee regarding the revised RIF Plan.

Mrs. Sands announced that since the RIF Plan will be decided at the Executive Committee/Dean's Meeting on the 16th of May, she would like to suggest changing the May 15 meeting to a Special Senate Meeting instead of the last regular meeting and have the last regular meeting on May 22 so a report can be made to the Senate then.

MOTION NO. 1061: Robert Jacobs moved, seconded by David Lygre, that the May 15 meeting be a Special Senate Meeting and the last regular meeting be moved to May 22 at which time the RIF Plan will be handled. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

A. Letter from Mr. Harrington, dated May 8, 1974.

The chairman read a letter she had written to Mr. Harrington on April 29, 1974 asking whether the salary of the 1974-75 Faculty Senate Chairman would be one-half time in .01 and one-half in .06 or whether the entire salary will be paid out of the chairman's departmental budget as has been the case this year.

The chairman then read Mr. Harrington's reply on May 8, 1974, in which he answered that the same situation will obtain in 1974-75

and that the department to which the new chairman belongs will have to "release" the faculty member one-half time for the chairmanship while still paying the faculty member's salary in full. He is hopeful that this situation can be reversed in succeeding biennia. He suggested that perhaps a separate budget can be set up in program "06" to fund the Faculty Senate Chairman.

NEW BUSINESS

Election of Senate Officers for 1974-75:

1. Chairman nominees were:

Duncan McQuarrie

There were no other nominations from the floor.

MOTION NO. 1062: John Purcell moved, seconded by David Anderson, that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for Duncan McQuarrie to be elected as chairman. The motion was voted on and passed with a unanimous voice ballot.

2. Vice-chairman nominees were:

Thomas Yeh
Madge Young
David Lygre

David Lygre was elected as Vice-chairman on the first ballot by majority vote.

3. Secretary nominees were:

Louis Bovos
Madge Young
Thomas Thelen
Lee Fisher

Madge Young was elected Senate Secretary for 1974-75 on the second ballot by majority vote.

4. At-Large Executive Committee Officers (2):

Darwin Goode
John Vifian
Robert Bennett
Zolton Kramar
Madge Young

Mr. Vifian and Robert Bennett were elected on the first ballot by majority vote.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Code Committee Report--

Mr. Willberg presented the Code Committee Majority Report On President Brooks' Proposed Code Of Personnel Policy and Procedure.

MOTION NO. 1063: Mr. Willberg moved, seconded by Mr. Nylander, that the Senate accept the recommendation as given in the Code Committee Majority Report on President Brooks' Proposed Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure.

Mr. Canzler, Chairman of the Code Committee, then presented the Minority Report

MOTION NO. 1064: Mr. Canzler moved, seconded by Neil Gillam, to amend the motion on the floor by substituting the word minority for the word majority and that the Senate accept the recommendation as given in the Minority Report.

The chairman asked Mr. Canzler if the objections to the Proposed Code raised by the faculty had been presented to President Brooks.

Mr. Canzler said no, but he did present Mr. Brooks with a list of sections which were most frequently mentioned.

The chairman announced that Mr. Brooks had given her the letters from the Deans and he indicated on the letters those sections of the Proposed Code which have already been changed. Mr. Brooks is now working on the AAUP suggested changes.

There was a great deal of discussion on the motion and the amendment to the motion.

MOTION NO. 1065: Mr. Dudley moved, seconded by Mr. Vifian, to amend the amendment to the motion to state as follows: The majority report recommends that the Faculty Senate reject outright the Proposed Code by voting against its ratification, and we further recommend that the Senate request Dr. Brooks to work with the Code Committee to modify section 000-099 so that it clearly reflects a commitment to shared governance in the Proposed Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure. And we further recommend that when this section is approved by the Senate, faculty, and accepted by the Board, then the entire Code be revised and submitted to the faculty for referendum by section.

There was considerable discussion on the amendment to the amendment to the main motion.

MOTION NO. 1066: Mr. McQuarrie moved, seconded by Mr. Lygre, for the previous question and to address discussion to the amendment to the amendment to the main motion.

A roll call vote was called for:

Aye: Peter Burkholder, Stanley Dudley, Duncan McQuarrie, David Anderson, Betty Trout, Milo Smith, Patti Picha, Derek Sandison, John Purcell, and Madge Young.

Nay: Thomas Thelen, Gordon Leavitt, John Vifian, George Stillman, Nancy Lester, James Nylander, Jim Applegate, Neil Gillam, Robert Bennett, Lee Fisher, Charles McGehee, Roger Garrett, Calvin Willberg, David Canzler, Betty Hileman, Robert Jacobs, Thomas Yeh, Ken Harsha, and Art Keith.

Abstain: David Lygre

The motion failed. *move the previous question.*

Discussion on the amended motion continued.

MOTION NO. 1067: Mr. Jacobs moved, seconded by Mr. Fisher, that the main motion and subsequent amendments be tabled. The motion was voted on and passed with a majority voice vote.

MOTION NO. 1068: Mr. Jacobs moved, seconded by Mr. Fisher, that the proposed Code be rejected by the Faculty Senate and that we recommend that the Senate request Dr. Brooks to work with the Code Committee to modify section 000-099 so that it clearly reflects a commitment to shared governance in the Proposed Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure. And we further recommend that when this section is approved by the Senate, faculty, and accepted by the Board of Trustees then the entire Code be revised and submitted to the faculty for referendum by section.

A roll call vote was called for:

Aye: Duncan McQuarrie, Ken Harsha, James Nylander, Lee Fisher, John Vifian, Neil Gillam, Art Keith, Robert Bennett, George Stillman, David Canzler, Patti Picha, David Lygre, Roger Garrett, Nancy Lester, Milo Smith, Thomas Thelen, Stanley Dudley, Gordon Leavitt, Thomas Yeh, John Purcell, David Anderson, Jim Applegate, Robert Jacobs, Madge Young, Betty Trout, Peter Burkholder, Charles McGehee, and Derek Sandison.

Nay: Betty Hileman

Abstain: None

The motion passed.

- B. Report on the RIF--David Anderson reported briefly on the Executive Committee's role in regard to the RIF. The Executive Committee has been involved in two aspects of the RIF Plan.

The primary concern has been development of a plan for 1975-76. Betty Hileman, secretary, reported to the Senate the reasons for the delays in the decision making. Statistics and enrollments for the entire College, that have just been finalized, were necessary before any considerations of RIF could take place.

The legislature says that Central is to be at 72 per cent of formula by 1975.

The Senate Executive Committee is to have their plan finalized by May 13. The Executive Committee meeting with the Deans and Vice President Harrington is scheduled for May 16. The final plan will be the result of this joint meeting.

The chairman mentioned that Dr. Harrington is submitting a proposed Amendment to the 1973 RIF policy which clearly spells out seniority for tenured and non-tenured faculty members and how they should be computed.

The Executive Committee was asked to make sure that the 4th quarter option be kept as an alternative.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

AGENDA
SPECIAL SENATE MEETING
3 p.m., Wednesday, May 8, 1974
Room 471, Psychology Building

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
- III. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. Election of Executive Committee
- IV. OLD BUSINESS
 - A. Code Committee Report
- V. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF _____

ROLL CALL

SENATORALTERNATE

✓ Anderson, David
 ✓ Applegate, Jim
 ✓ Bennett, Robert
 ✓ Bovos, Louis
 Brooks, James

William Cutlip
 Frank Carlson
 Robert Bentley
 James Holister
 Edward Harrington

✓ Canzler, David
 ✓ Dudley, Stanley
 ✓ Fisher, Lee
 ✓ Garrett, Roger

Richard Johnson
 Gerald Brunner
 Robert Cooper
 Starla Drum

✓ Gillam, Neil
 Goodey, Darwin

Donald Cocheba
 ✓ James Klahn

✓ Harsha, Ken
 ✓ Hileman, Betty

Marie Madison
 Helen McCabe

Hood, Webster
 ✓ Jacobs, Robert
 ✓ Keith, Art
 Kramar, Zolton
 ✓ Lester, Nancy

✓ Peter Burkholder
 Thomas Kerr
 Glenn Madsen
 Gordon Warren
 Dieter Romboy

✓ Leavitt, Gordon
 ✓ Lygre, David
 ✓ McGehee, Charles
 ✓ McQuarrie, Duncan
 ✓ Nylander, James

John DeMerchant
 Helmi Habib
 William Benson
 Owen Pratz
 John Pearson

Owens, B. Dean
 ✓ Purcell, John
 ✓ Sands, Catherine
 ✓ Smith, Milo

Eileen Calkins
 Kent Martin
 Marco Bicchieri
 A. James Hawkins

✓ Stillman, George
 ✓ Thelen, Thomas
 ✓ Trout, Betty
 ✓ Vifian, John
 ✓ Willberg, Calvin
 ✓ Yeh, Thomas
 ✓ Young, Madge

Christos Papadopoulos
 Glen Clark
 Pearl Douce
 Bruce Teets
 Otto Jakubek
 William Craig
 Robert Carlton

✓ Picha, Patti
 ✓ ~~Piccerbo~~ x Bob
 ✓ Ramon, Mercado
 ✓ Sandison, Derek

RANDOM
ROLL CALL VOTE

<u>Senator</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
Hood, Webster	✓			Peter Burkholder
Dudley, Stanley	✓			Gerald Brunner
Goodey, Darwin				James Klahn
Lygre, David			✓	Helmi Habib
McQuarrie, Duncan	✓			Owen Pratz
Thelen, Thomas		✓		Glen Clark
Leavitt, Gordon		✓		John DeMerchant
Vifian, John		✓		Bruce Teets
Anderson, David	✓			William Butlip
Stillman, George		✓		C. Papadopoulos
Lester, Nancy		✓		Dieter Romboy
Trout, Betty	✓			Pearl Douce
Nylander, James		✓		John Pearson
Applegate, Jim		✓		Frank Carlson
Gillam, Neil		✓		Donald Cocheba
Smith, Milo	✓			A. James Hawkins
Bennett, Robert		✓		Robert Bentley
Brooks, James				Edward Harrington
Owens, B. Dean				Eileen Calkins
Vos, Louis				James Hollister
Fisher, Lee		✓		Robert Cooper
Picha, Patti	✓			
Kramar, Zolton				Gordon Warren
McGehee, Charles		✓		William Benson
Garrett, Roger		✓		Starla Drum
Willberg, Calvin		✓		Otto Jakubek
Sandison, Derek	✓			Harrison
Canzler, David		✓		Richard Johnson
Sands, Catherine				Marco Bicchieri
Hileman, Betty		✓		Helen McCabe
Jacobs, Robert		✓		Thomas Kerr
Ramon, Mercado				
Purcell, John	✓			Kent Martin
Yeh, Thomas		✓		William Craig
Harsha, Ken		✓		Marie Madison
Keith, Art		✓		Ken Madsen
Young, Madge	✓			Robert Carlton
	10	19	1	

Jacobs
Fisher

RANDOM
LL CALL VOTE

<u>Senator</u>	<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
McQuarrie, Duncan	✓			Owen Pratz
Sands, Catherine				Marco Bicchieri
Bovos, Louis				James Hollister
Harsha, Ken	✓			Marie Madison
Nylander, James	✓			John Pearson
Goodey, Darwin	✓			James Klahn
Fisher, Lee	✓			Robert Cooper
Owens, B. Dean				Eileen Calkins
Vilfan, John	✓			Bruce Teets
Gilliam, Neil	✓			Donald Cocheba
Keith, Art	✓			Glen Madsen
Bennett, Robert	✓			Robert Bentley
Stillman, George	✓			C. Papadopoulos
Canzler, David	✓			Richard Johnson
Picha, Patti	✓			
Brooks, James				Edward Harrington
gre, David	✓			Helmi Habib
Garrett, Roger	✓			Starla Drum
Willberg, Calvin				Otto Jakubek
Lester, Nancy	✓			Dieter Romboy
Smith, Milo	✓			A. James Hawkins
Thelen, Thomas	✓			Glen Clark
Dudley, Stanley	✓			Gerald Brunner
Leavitt, Gordon	✓			John DeMerchant
Yeh, Thomas	✓			William Craig
DiCerbo, Bob				
Ramon, Mercado				
Purcell, John	✓			Kent Martin
Anderson, David	✓			William Cutlip
Hleman, Betty		✓		Helen McCabe
Kramar, Zolton				Gordon Warren
Applegate, Jim	✓			Frank Carlson
Jacobs, Robert	✓			Thomas Kerr
Young, Madge	✓			Robert Carlton
Trout, Betty	✓			Pearl Douce'
Hood, Webster	✓			Peter Burkholder
Gehee, Charles	✓			William Benson
andison, Derek	✓			
	28	1		

April 29, 1974

Dr. Edward Harrington
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Campus

Dear Dr. Harrington:

This year I am listed as one-half time in .01 and one-half in .06. My salary, however, is being paid entirely out of the Anthropology Department Budget.

There have been some inquiries from the members of the Senate Executive Committee as to future Senate chairman salaries.

I know that in view of R.I.F. the arrangement this year may only be temporary and may have been politically expedient to arrange that my salary be handled only from one budget.

In order to answer any questions that may arise from possible candidates for senate chairman, would you please supply me with this information so that it will go on file.

Sincerely,

Catherine J. Sands
Chairman, Faculty Senate

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON
98926

May 8, 1974

RECEIVED

MAY 8 1974

FACULTY SENATE

Mrs. Catherine J. Sands
Chairperson, Faculty Senate
CWSC, Campus

Dear Mrs. Sands:

In answer to your letter of April 29, 1974 the Faculty Senate Chairmanship this year has, indeed, been "subsidized" by the Anthropology Department's budget. That is to say, you are correct in assuming this was the source of your salary for academic year 1973-74.

Given our budget crisis the same situation will obtain in 1974-75; the department to which the new chairman belongs will have to "release" the faculty member one-half time for the chairmanship while still paying the faculty member's salary in full.

Hopefully this situation can be reversed in succeeding biennia. Perhaps a separate budget can be set up in program "06" to fund the Faculty Senate Chairman.

Meanwhile the situation described above will have to continue next year.

Sincerely,



Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc: Dr. Brooks

NOMINATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN

Duncan McQuarrie

*motion
unanimous
ballot
passed*

VICE-CHAIRMAN

Thomas Yeh

Madge Young

David Lygre

*1st ballot
by majority vote*

SECRETARY

~~Louis Jones~~

out on list

Madge Young

2nd ballot

Thomas Thelen

~~Lee Fisher~~

out on list

AT-LARGE OFFICER

~~David Goodie~~

John Vifian

1st ballot

Robert Bennett

1st ballot

Zolton Kramar

~~Madge Young~~

CODE COMMITTEE MINORITY REPORT
May 8, 1974

The Faculty Senate Code Committee received oral and written testimony on President Brooks' proposed code revision of 3/25/74 from April 17th to April 26th. Thirty-three faculty members made written responses, as did the Department of Economics and Business Administration and the local AAUP chapter. Nine faculty members gave formal oral testimony and about as many others spoke informally at the hearing on April 22nd.

Of the 100 numbered items in the proposed code, 74 received criticism from one or more persons, and no less than eighteen items were criticized by four or more faculty members. Over three-quarters of the respondents found the opening section, "Code, Code Revision," unacceptable. No one indicated even qualified support of it, in either written or oral testimony.

Eleven persons spoke to the inadequacy of Section 3.72 (Termination of Appointments by the College), the next largest complaint. Nine comments were received on Section 2.45 (Salary Adjustments), and eight on Section 3.87 (Procedure for Formal Hearings). Another eight complained of Section 2.74 (Professional Leave). Section 3.34 (Use of College Facilities) was criticized by seven faculty members and Sections 2.30, 2.38 and 2.50 (Procedure for Determining Promotions, Faculty Load, and Salary Policies for Miscellaneous Appointments) received six comments each. Other sections receiving four or five comments had to do with minimum qualifications for academic rank, types of appointments, non-reappointment notice requirements, definition of faculty, academic freedom, consulting and outside work, retirement, appointment of faculty members, and the reduction in force policy.

In summary, the evidence presented the committee, both oral and written, was widespread, varied, and unanimously against acceptance of the March 25th draft. No one spoke in favor of it, while strong objections were voiced to many parts of it.

The minority report, then, is a recommendation that the Faculty Senate reject outright the proposed code by voting against its ratification.



David G. Canzler
Chairman, Code Committee

CODE COMMITTEE MAJORITY REPORT
ON
PRESIDENT BROOKS' PROPOSED CODE OF PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURE

In accordance with what we believe to be the charge given us by the full Senate, the Code Committee has held hearings and solicited written statements from the faculty of Central Washington State College to reflect its views on the Proposed Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure.

The rationale for requesting written statements was to provide a record of commentary that could be viewed as bona fide evidence of the feelings of the faculty about the new proposed code and that was not limited by summarization of the Code Committee. Our hope was that this record could be used to assist in future changes to be made in that code.

After reading the statements, the question arose as to whether some were intended for public review. It was decided, therefore, that none would be released without that person's specific consent. The oral testimony given in open hearings is being transcribed and certainly can be released as public record.

If the count has been tabulated correctly, there were thirty three (33) written statements by individuals, one (1) departmental response of eighteen (18) faculty, the AAUP response and nine (9) oral testimonies in the hearings.

In the main the responses were critical of the proposed code. Section 000-099 received the greatest number of comments by respondents. This section relates to the implementation of the Proposed Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure. Paragraphs cited and objected to are these:

- .01 which gives justification and sets new standards for code change;
- .05 which removes all legal encumbrances of former codes;
- .10 (5) which gives the President the right and obligation to amend the code yearly;
- .10 (6) which provides for the Board of Trustees as the sole interpreters of the code;
- .15 which does not bind the Trustees to any provision of the code;
- .20 which eliminates faculty involvement in code revision and change except for recommendations.

The section to receive the next highest number of comments was 3.72; this deals with the termination of appointments. There were eleven (11) individual responses. Other sections range from nine (9) through four (4) responses.

It is felt that the proportions of these responses demonstrates that the greatest concern of the faculty lies in the negation of a commitment to shared governance.

It is the desire of the majority of the Code Committee to get the president's proposed code before the entire faculty for a vote of acceptance or rejection. Only the Senate can make this possible. As it stands now, the Senate is not likely to vote approval to bring it to the faculty. At the same time, the Trustees appear to be destined to vote its approval. With this situation confronting us, the majority of the Code Committee makes the following recommendation to the Senate:

motion (We recommend that the Senate request Dr. Brooks to work with the Code Committee to modify section 000-099 so that it clearly reflects a commitment to shared governance in the Proposed Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure. And we further recommend that when this section is approved by the Senate, the ^{faculty} ~~entire~~ Code be ^{Board} ~~revised~~ submitted to the faculty for referendum by section.

What is the rationale for this recommendation? We would like to quote from the written statement submitted to the committee by Dr. Martin Kaatz:

"The amendment procedure in the present Code is consistent with the idea that faculty, administration, and board are a team whose principal responsibility is to ensure that Central's students are provided an outstanding education. The faculty is directly involved in the education process, the administration seeks to provide the circumstances whereby the faculty's task will be expedited and the board is responsible to the state for the effective operation of both. Each of the three entities is strengthened by the quality of the wisdom and talents of the others.

The hierarchial organization: teaching faculty, chairman, dean, vice president, president, board is accepted by the faculty because it believes that it shares input with the others. Actions taken by higher authority are recognized so long as the faculty is assured of a significant voice and fair hearing prior to a final decision. As a result, the decisions of chairman, dean, vice president, president, and board are strengthened and given more weight by the knowledge that they have been arrived at by a kind of due process instead of unilaterally or arbitrarily."

It is Central's history to have had a process of shared governance, faculty, administration, and trustees all working to make Central a fine educational institution. If now this shared governance is destroyed, Central will lose the essence of the confidence it has enjoyed between faculty, administration and trustees. This same confidence may never be attained again.

Trustees are appointed for six years; the president may hold office for 25 years; faculty sometimes stay for 30 to 35 years. The institution will outlast all.

If the principles of shared governance are continued by the trustees, the integrity of the community at Central will remain intact.

Robert B. Brooks
Thomas J. Galt

William B. Williams
John Carpenter